



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BOOK REVIEWS

EDITED BY W. B. MUNRO

*Harvard University*

*The Life of the Rt. Hon. Sir Charles W. Dilke.* Begun by STEPHEN GWYNN, M.P. Completed and edited by Gertrude M. Tuckwell, Literary Executrix of Sir Charles W. Dilke. Two volumes. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1917. Pp. xix, 557; vii, 614.)

Within a year after Sir Charles Dilke left Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and at the time when—in 1866—he was making a tour of the English-speaking world, he confided to his brother, Ashton Dilke, that he had educated himself and was still educating himself, so that he could be most useful as a statesman and as a writer. “My aim in life,” he added, “is to be of the greatest use I can to the world at large, not because that is my duty, but because that is the course which will make my life happiest.”

Dilke was not born into the English governing class. His grandfather was owner of the *Athenaeum* and was associated in a managerial capacity with the *Daily News* in its early years. It was Charles Dilke’s father on whom the baronetcy was conferred for his part in organizing the international exhibition of 1851 in London. But the grandfather was a publicist; and it was his grandfather who was chiefly responsible for Sir Charles Dilke’s education and for the bent towards politics that was characteristic of Dilke even before he wrote from Denver, Colorado, the letter in which he informed his brother that he had begun his apprenticeship to statesmanship. Two years later Dilke was elected for Chelsea as a Radical; and except for an interval from 1886 to 1892 he was of the house of commons from 1868 to his death in 1910.

Mr. Stephen Gwynn and Miss Gertrude Tuckwell’s well-written, well-ordered, and exceptionally informing biography, tells with an interest that is continuous how Dilke, in seasons that were prosperous, and in seasons that were adverse, worked to realize the aim that in 1866 he had set before himself as his guiding principle in life. Dilke’s

prosperous season (1868-1885) brought him advancement to an amazing degree. By temperament, intellectual equipment and interest he was singularly well-adapted for both parliamentary and official life; and his advancement in the years from 1868 to 1885 is an indication of the extent to which politics at Westminster in the two decades that came after the second reform act became less and less a field reserved for the territorial governing class and its protégés. Dilke had no connection, direct or indirect, with the governing class. A man of his independence and outspokenness could never have sat for a nomination borough; although some nomination boroughs survived both the reform act of 1832 and that of 1867. Dilke would have been ill at ease as the representative of such a borough or as the protégé of any highly-placed member of the governing class. He went into Parliament as the representative of a large London borough, in which, in the years from 1867 to 1884, the radical element was predominant.

From his entrance into the house of commons he took politics seriously. It was his only business in life. He was assiduous in his work at Westminster; always kept in closest touch with his constituency; and the remarkable progress he made from 1868 to 1885 in the house and in the constituencies was due partly to his equipment, partly to his intense interest in politics, and to a considerable degree to the industry and thoroughness that were characteristic of his long political life. His prominence and service in the house of commons as an unofficial member, and his acceptability in the constituencies as an exponent of advanced Liberalism, had by 1879 secured for him so well-established a place in the Liberal party, that in that year Beaconsfield, always alert to note the development of new ability in the political world, predicted that Dilke would be Gladstone's successor. Gladstone himself arrived at the same conclusion in 1882, after Dilke had served two years in the first office to which he was appointed—that of under-secretary for foreign affairs in the Liberal administration of 1880-85.

Promotion came quickly to Dilke. He was of the cabinet as president of the local government board by the end of 1882; and the premiership was well in sight when, to the astonishment and dismay of the political world of England, he was cited as co-respondent in the Crawford case that came before the divorce court in London in 1885. Dilke was dismissed from the suit. His biographers are convinced that the allegations against him were unfounded. But their history of the case is not convincing. It is the least satisfactory chapter in a biography that for many years to come must rank high in the political literature

of England, that must be read by every student who would familiarize himself with the constitutional, parliamentary, party and social history of England of the period between the reform act of 1867 and the Teutonic onslaught on civilization that began in 1914.

Fortunately it is not necessary to arrive at any opinion on the Crawford case as it is presented in these pages in order to appreciate Dilke's political work, either before or after his disappearance from the house of commons from 1885 to 1892. What is clear from the biography is that after his return to the house of commons for the Forest of Dean in 1892 the possibility of the premiership or even of a place in the Liberal ministries of 1892-95 and 1906-10 was gone; that he did not regain the position he had held as an unofficial member before 1880; and that despite adverse conditions, he accomplished much in and out of Parliament in the years from 1892 to 1910 as a result of his keen interest in industrial and social questions, such as old age pensions, dangerous trades and sweated industries, and of his continuous association in its legislative aims with the Labor party that established itself in the house of commons at the general election of 1906.

Labor politics had an attraction for Dilke during his first term in Parliament. George Odgers, one of the earliest of Labor candidates, assisted him in his electoral campaign in Chelsea in 1868; and in 1869 Dilke, Fawcett and Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice supported Odgers, when as a Labor candidate he contested the borough of Southwark in opposition to a Liberal and a Conservative candidate. To social politics, and in particular to the movement for better housing of the wage-earning classes, Dilke had given much attention when he was at the local government board in 1882-1885; and when he resumed his political activities in the constituencies and in the house of commons, so far as domestic politics were concerned, it was to labor and industry that he devoted most of his attention.

It is not possible to estimate what English political life lost by the catastrophe of 1885. But it is certain that industrial legislation was beneficently accelerated—that some industrial reforms, hitherto regarded as impossible, were achieved—through Dilke's later career in the house of commons, and by the organization work of which his home in Sloane Street, Chelsea, was for many years the center. One word more. The Dilke biography covers much more ground, opens up avenues of English political, industrial and social conditions more than is usual in biographies of men who reached cabinet rank. Dilke's

political interests after 1886 account for this, and put his life outside the conventional run of much English political biography.

EDWARD PORRITT.

*Hartford, Conn.*

*Démocratie et Politique étrangère.* By JOSEPH-BARTHÉLEMY, Professeur Agrégé à la Faculté de Droit de Paris, Professeur à l'École Libre des Sciences Politiques. (Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan. 1917. Pp. 531.)

This is one of the most scholarly and comprehensive treatises in the vast output of literature which the present war may be said to have provoked. There had already appeared in England and America a considerable literature dealing with the subject of secret diplomacy to which many persons are disposed to attribute responsibility for wars in general and the present war in particular, but most of it was unscientific and polemic in character. In the present work, however, we have the first elaborate, scientific treatment of the subject by a distinguished scholar whose familiarity with the history of European foreign policy reveals itself throughout his treatise.

M. Barthélemy divides his work into three parts: the first, entitled "democracy and diplomacy" in which he discusses the question as to whether a democratic form of government is as well fitted as monarchy for conducting diplomacy and examines into the proper organization of a democracy for efficient diplomacy; the second, entitled "democracy and war" in which he considers the capacity of a democracy for prosecuting war, its proper organization for the efficient carrying on of war, the rôle of the legislature, the executive, etc., in time of war; and the third, entitled "the democracy of nations" in which he considers the relations between the internal and international policy of country, the liberty and solidarity of nations, etc.

There is, as the author points out, a more or less widespread belief that a democratically organized government, controlled by public opinion, whose processes must be open and subject to the light of publicity, and which does not look with favor upon a permanent professionally trained diplomatic service, is at a disadvantage as compared with monarchy in the conduct of diplomatic intercourse. Monarchy has the advantage of a permanent, highly trained diplomatic personnel; it is less controlled by an uninstructed public opinion; the influence of a highly respected and long experienced hereditary executive is often a